Inside this issue:

- **CFR: "No" to Decoupling From China**
- **CFR's Posen: Trump Will Lose the U.S./China Trade War**
- **Will China Start a War to Save Face?**
- **Video Shows Massive Pileup of Containers at Chinese Ports**
- **WHO Pandemic Treaty: It's Ba-a-ack!**
- **UN Global Shipping Carbon Tax, Not Tariffs, Is the Real Threat**
- **Gold, Silver Make Advances in State Legislation**
- **Health Freedom: Ivermectin OTC Wins in Arkansas, Idaho**
- **Second Announcement for Our Premier Showing of Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline**

CFR: "No" to Decoupling From China, "Yes" to "De-risking"

If you read *Foreign Affairs,* the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations, you might have noticed over the past few years more than a few articles damning proposals for "decoupling" the United States' economy from that of China. That would be "disastrous," the CFR choir has intoned over and over again. But, then, what to do about the rising chorus of concern over our dangerous dependence on the communist Beijing regime for everything from medicine, electronics, and tools to clothing, appliances, cellphones, computers — and, increasingly, food? Especially when these concerns are being fanned by a MAGA cheerleader like Donald Trump?

Hmmm. Time to reach into reach into the CFR's bag of verbal sleight-of-hand tricks. Instead of causing global chaos and harming American consumers by decoupling, the CFR-led foreign-policy establishment chimed in unison, let's "de-risk" our relationship with Beijing. But even a cursory examination of the "de-risking" proposals quickly reveals that they are purely eyewash aimed at mollifying the booboisie apprehensions about the growing CCP influence in all aspects of our lives. The de-riskers say they would limit Beijing's access to U.S. high tech items that would boost China's military prowess. They offer a few other minor tweaks, but essentially want to maintain the current suicidal course. The CFR de-risking lobby just happens to be the same cabal that designed, promoted, defended, and maintained our traitorous China trade policy over the past half century. Their "de-risking" schemes are recipes for maintaining the same destructive course but seasoned with empty promises about guarding against CCP treachery and exploitation.

Thus, continuing the de-risking propaganda, the current issue (March/April 2025) of *Foreign Affairs* brings us "The Real China Trump Card: The Hawk's Case Against Decoupling" by Stephen G. Brooks and Ben A. Vagle. This is but the latest salvo in a constant barrage over the past several years. Here's a sample of the *Foreign Affairs* decoupling/de-risking broadsides:

"America's China Policy Is Not Working: The Dangers of a Broad Decoupling";

"The U.S.-Chinese Economic Relationship Is Changing — but Not Vanishing: How 'De-Risking' Can Preserve Healthy Integration";

Contributors: Gary Benoit • Steve Bonta • Paul Dragu • Christian Gomez

William F. Jasper • Alex Newman • Peter Rykowski • Rebecca Terrell • Joe Wolverton II, J.D.

Copyright ©2025 by *The New American*

"The Folly of Decoupling From China: It Isn't Just Perilous — It's Impossible";

"The Climate Case Against Decoupling: Severing U.S.-Chinese Links Would Make It Impossible to Save the Environment";

"The Security Risks of a Trade War With China: Why the U.S. Should Be Wary of Economic Decoupling";

"Hong Kong and the Limits of Decoupling: Why America Struggles to Punish China for Its Repression";

"The Problem With De-Risking: Transitioning to Clean Energy Requires Trade With China";

"The Dangers of Detachment: Why Economic Independence Could Make the World More Dangerous."

There's much more, but you get the picture. And it's not just *Foreign Affairs*, of course; the CFR-aligned media cartel has picked up the globalist decoupling/de-risking sophistry and passed it on to their audiences. So, when Biden National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan announced that the United States is "for de-risking, not for decoupling," he was merely relaying the policy dogma emanating from the Pratt House, the CFR's New York headquarters. Ditto for Biden Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen (a CFR member and former Federal Reserve chief) and her "de-risking" trip to China in 2023. Double ditto for the G-7 leaders' communiqué at the 2023 Hiroshima summit, which called for an approach to China based on "de-risking, not decoupling." — William F. Jasper

CFR's Posen: Trump Will Lose the U.S./China Trade War

According to the flagship journal of the American globalist establishment, *Foreign Affairs*, Trump will lose the trade war with China. In a piece dripping with *Foreign Affairs*' patented elitist snark, titled "Trade Wars Are Easy to Lose," Adam S. Posen writes smugly that China has "escalation dominance" in this trade war, because the essential goods and services it produces are more important to the United States than lost revenues are to China. For the uninitiated, Posen informs his readers that "escalation dominance" is a term originating with game theory, a supposedly infallible branch of

modern mathematics much in vogue in certain academic precincts.

More to the point are Posen's own credentials: He's president of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, a globalist think tank founded by C. Fred Bergsten, a longtime champion of global taxation, and named after its first chairman, Peter G. Peterson, former secretary of commerce and longtime power broker at the Council of Foreign Relations and numerous other globalist organizations. The Peterson Institute prides itself for "provid[ing] some of the intellectual foundations for many major international policy initiatives of the past four decades," including, per its website:

- reforms of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), initiated by the G-20 in 2009-10;
- creation of the TPP initiative and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum;

- quantitative easing and adapting monetary policy to a low interest rate world;
- reform of US sanctions policy;
- initiation and implementation of the Strategic and Economic Dialogue between the United States and China;
- the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and other US free trade agreements (notably with Korea);
- adoption of international banking standards and broader financial regulatory reforms.

In other words, Posen and the Peterson Institute are at the very heart of the modern globalist agenda. With that in mind, consider what Posen has to say about the Trump tariffs vis-à-vis China:

> China … has escalation dominance in this trade war. The United States gets vital goods from China that cannot be replaced any time soon or made at home at anything less than prohibitive cost. Reducing such dependence on China may be a reason for action, but fighting the current war before doing so is a recipe for almost certain defeat, at enormous cost. Or to put it in Bessent's terms: Washington, not Beijing, is betting all in on a losing hand.
>
> The [Trump] administration's claims are off base on two counts. For one thing, both sides get hurt in a trade war, because both lose access to things their economies want and need and that their people and companies are willing to pay for. Like launching an actual war, a trade war is an act of destruction that puts the attacker's own forces and home front at risk, as well: if the defending side did not believe it could retaliate in a way that would harm the attacker, it would surrender.

The New American
TOP DAILY HEADLINES
YOUR RED-PILLED INTELLIGENCE SOURCE!
STRAIGHT FROM OUR PAGES TO YOUR INBOX
Follow us on Social Media

The Trump administration believes that the more you import, the less you have at stake — that because the United States has a trade deficit with China, importing more Chinese goods and services than China does U.S. goods and services, it is less vulnerable. This is factually wrong, not a matter of opinion. Blocking trade reduces a nation's real income and purchasing power; countries export in order to earn the money to buy things they do not have or are too expensive to make at home.

What's more, even if you focus solely on the bilateral trade balance, as the Trump administration does, it bodes poorly for the United States in a trade war with China. In 2024, U.S. exports of goods and services to China were $199.2 billion, and imports from China were $462.5 billion, resulting in a trade deficit of $263.3 billion. To the degree that the bilateral trade balance predicts which side will "win" in a trade war, the advantage lies with the surplus economy, not the deficit one. China, the surplus country, is giving up sales, which is solely money; the United States, the deficit country, is giving up goods and services it does not produce competitively or at all at home. Money is fungible: if you lose income, you can cut back spending, find sales elsewhere, spread the burden across the country, or draw down savings (say, by doing fiscal stimulus). China, like most countries with overall trade surpluses, saves more than it invests — meaning that it, in a sense, has too much savings. The adjustment would be relatively easy. There would be no critical shortages, and it could replace much of what it normally sold to the United States with sales domestically or to others.

> Countries with overall trade deficits, like the United States, spend more than they save. In trade wars, they give up or reduce the supply of things they need (since the tariffs make them cost more), and these are not nearly as fungible or easily substituted for as money. Consequently, the impact is felt in specific industries, locations, or households that face shortages, sometimes of necessary items, some of which are irreplaceable in the short term. Deficit countries also import capital — which makes the United States more vulnerable to shifts in sentiment about the reliability of its government and about its attractiveness as a place to do business. When the Trump administration makes capricious decisions to impose an enormous tax increase and great uncertainty on manufacturers' supply chains, the result will be reduced investment into the United States, raising interest rates on its debt.
>
> In short, the U.S. economy will suffer enormously in a large-scale trade war with China, which the current levels of Trump-imposed tariffs, at more than 100 percent, surely constitute if left in place. In fact, the U.S. economy will suffer more than the Chinese economy will, and the suffering will only increase if the United States escalates. The Trump administration may think it's acting tough, but it's in fact putting the U.S. economy at the mercy of Chinese escalation.

As with so much media-fueled criticism of Trump's policies, Posen's article is full of alarmist language (for example, he compares Trump's trade war on China to the Vietnam War, and predicts a similarly dreary outcome). But what has Posen and his CFR confreres (yes, Posen is a CFR member) incandescent with indignation is that the Trump China tariffs threaten to undermine the very international order they have created — see the Peterson Institute's self-proclaimed involvement in the creation of the TPP and APEC, as well as the aforementioned "Strategic and Economic Dialogue between the United States and China."

But do Posen's claims have any economic merit? After all, Trump's tariffs have come under fire from more than just the globalist claque. While we concede that "both sides get hurt in a trade war," the analogy with real war is misleading. For one thing, real wars involve real, irrevocable destruction of life and property, and are always and everywhere the agents of national ruination and social decline. Real wars are never productive, as Bastiat's famous "broken window" parable long ago made clear. Trade "wars," by contrast, despite the lurid terminology, are actually disputes over trade that involve the adjustment of export and import policies — usually, although not always, centered on tariffs. So-called trade wars can lead to disruption in the flow of trade and changes in the allocation of extraction and manufacturing enterprises. But they are in nowise comparable with the real destruction visited by real war.

Let's look at a few other claims set forth by Posen.

> The Trump administration believes that the more you import, the less you have at stake…. This is factually wrong, not a matter of opinion. Blocking trade reduces a nation's real income and purchasing power; countries export in order to earn the money to buy things they do not have or are too expensive to make at home.

How is this an indictment of Trump's policies? The clear inference is that China, the exporter, will quickly be cash-strapped and bereft of purchasing power, a fact that seems to be borne out by the torrent of bad news coming out of China of shuttered factories, unsold inventory, containers piling up at wharfs, etc. A key assumption of

Posen is that modern economies are more or less equivalent, when, in fact, the contrasts between the United States and China are stark. Where the United States has a resilient, more-or-less capitalist system (despite decades of hindrance by would-be central planners and bureaucrats in Washington), China's economy is entirely a state-directed enterprise. The miraculous rise of China — unlike that of the capitalist West — has not been, in the main, a market-driven phenomenon, but is the result of deliberate engineering by globalists determined to use China to suck the West dry. No one in China is free to start an enterprise larger than a noodle shop without being allied with the Communist Party. All companies of any consequence are required to have Party members within their leadership. The same is true of research facilities, colleges, universities, and so forth. China has virtually zero civil society, because organizations founded spontaneously by the people all pose a potential threat to the monopoly on power enjoyed by the Communist Party. And China's economy is teetering on the brink of utter collapse owing to a host of factors having nothing to do with Trump. Contrary to foreign perceptions, China's public debt is far higher than America's. China's currency, unlike the U.S. dollar, is used very little outside of China itself. All of which is to say that China's economy is on much shakier grounds than that of the United States, a fact that the globalists might grasp were they not so wedded to socialist ideology. Posen also remarked:

> To the degree that the bilateral trade balance predicts which side will 'win' in a trade war, the advantage lies with the surplus economy, not the deficit one. China, the surplus country, is giving up sales, which is solely money; the United States, the deficit country, is giving up goods and services it does not produce competitively or at all at home. Money is fungible: if you lose income, you can cut back spending, find sales elsewhere, spread the burden across the country, or draw down savings.

First of all, China has little to no savings to draw down. Secondly, finding sales "elsewhere" is a difficult proposition, since the United States consumes most of what China manufactures. Is "elsewhere" to be some regional toady like Vietnam? Or perhaps some Western nations, indignant at Trump's tariffs on their own account? Posen overstates the impact that reduced access to Chinese goods will have, while ignoring the impact of China's having to find new buyers in short order.

Also, note Posen's careful and misleading choice of words: The United States will lose goods and services that "it does not produce competitively or at all at home." This is very different from stating that we *cannot* produce them. In point of fact, we can, and have, until the fairly recent past. The fact that we do not currently is a reflection not of the workings of free-market economics but of the baneful anti-market domestic economic policies that our elites have foisted on us for decades. Re-incentivize domestic production via tax breaks and regulatory relief, and production will return to American shores, and return quickly. China, on the other hand, has no domestic capacity to ramp up production. Capital formation (and hence, wealth accumulation) in Communist China has always been completely contingent on foreign investment and preferential trade status. China, in other words, far from being a prodigy of capitalism, is history's largest "welfare queen." But all of these inconvenient facts are glibly glossed over in Posen's deceptive screed.

Elsewhere, he says:

> The U.S. economy will suffer more than the Chinese economy will, and the suffering will only increase if the United States escalates. The Trump administration may think it's acting tough, but it's in fact putting the U.S. economy at the mercy of Chinese escalation.

Absolute poppycock! First of all, for certain critical high-tech items, Trump's team has already carved out exemptions — for the short term, until we re-shore those critical industries. Secondly, a large proportion of Chinese imports are lower-quality consumer goods such as clothing and home appliances that wear out far sooner than the American-made goods our parents and grandparents enjoyed. True, higher-quality goods will cost more, but that is because of the effects of inflation, not tariffs. One oft-overlooked feature of "free trade" with China is that it has palliated the effects of inflation by allowing for cheaper, lower-quality options. Make no mistake about it: If Americans were still buying washers

and refrigerators that would last for decades, as our parents once did, they would cost a lot more than Chinese-made obsolescent knockoffs. And people would chafe far more at the effects of inflation than they have. In a word, people notice that most goods today are inferior to those of generations past, but they fail to realize that inflation is largely to blame, albeit indirectly.

In sum, the Chinese economy, being a socialist command economy benefitting from lavish foreign assistance, has no basis for "escalation dominance." Just as all of the alarums about a tariff-fueled global stock market crash and recession, which filled the legacy media only a week ago, have not aged well, so too will all of the gloomy prognostications about the U.S.-China tiff. If the Trump administration stays the course, China's economy will implode quickly. To believe otherwise is to believe that socialism trumps the free market. Wait and see.

(Again, we remind our readers that presidential tariffs are NOT constitutional. Our purpose with this item is to examine whether or not China has the upper hand economically).
— Steve Bonta

Will China Start a War to Save Face?

It's hard to know for sure, but it seems unlikely that Communist China will start a war they would likely lose. The United States, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines are all rapidly reconfiguring their forces in the area to forestall a Chinese invasion. However, Xi Jinping might be desperate enough to attempt an invasion of some of the outlying islands, especially Kinmen (aka Quemoy), the Taiwanese territory lying barely five miles off the Chinese coast of Fujian across from the major city of Xiamen (formerly Amoy). Another tempting target might be Pratas Island southeast of Hong Kong, on which several hundred Taiwanese servicemen are stationed. In either case, Xi has staked his entire reputation on the conquest of free Taiwan, and cannot deviate from that goal. A play for some Taiwanese territory near the Chinese coast or otherwise vulnerable would be both a sop to his domestic power base and an opportunity to test both the resolve and military abilities of Taiwan and the United States. Kinmen Island, which has more than 100,000 inhabitants, would be a substantial prize, and has been targeted by Communists on the mainland before. In 1949 and several times during the 1950s, the Communists attacked the island, but were repulsed each time by Taiwanese forces. As with all other past affronts in a face culture, the Chinese Communists still burn with the humiliation of those losses.

Xi may well calculate that the United States will not come to the aid of Kinmen, since the island is far from the rest of Taiwan and many of its inhabitants are fishermen. Accordingly, we predict that the most likely scenario for a hot war breaking out in the near future (possibly within months instead of years) would be a Communist assault on Kinmen, to save face over the collapsing economy, to test the will of the United States, and to set the stage for the bigger war to come.
— Steve Bonta

Video Shows Massive Pileup of Containers at Chinese Ports

China Observer, an independent online channel, features some astounding videos taken at Chinese ports and factories this past week. Just days after the imposition of U.S. tariffs, thousands of containers have been piling up in Chinese ports, almost completely shutting down the country's maritime traffic. Other videos show empty restaurants, near-empty factories, over-stocked warehouses, and anguished, laid-off workers. See here, here, here, and here. This is the real pain that might cause Xi Jinping to reconsider his hardline response to the U.S. tariffs. But don't expect to see this on our controlled legacy media channels.

These videos drive home another important point: The stunning aerial shots of unending mountains of containers (filled with goods intended for America) remind us of the enormity of the treachery of our trade policies over the past half century. Almost all those goods were previously made here in America. The products of all those factories in Zhejiang, Guangdong, and Shanghai used to be produced in factories in Detroit, Los Angeles, Dallas, and thousands of other American communities. But the globalists strip-mined America's industrial base to build up communist China. Thousands of American factories and millions of American jobs

THE ONYX COLLECTION
Showers & Lavatories
Custom Made in Kansas, USA Since 1985
800-669-9867 • www.onyxcollection.com
MADE IN THE USA

were shipped to the "People's Republic" under the rubric of "free trade." It's time to repatriate them.

From Henry Kissinger and Winston Lord to Janet Yellen and Jake Sullivan, U.S. policymakers, both Republican and Democrat, have participated in this globalist-communist treason. The aid and trade policies that they engineered have transformed a hopelessly backward totalitarian regime into a near-peer totalitarian regime. Our window of opportunity for reversing this fatal trend is fast closing. If we do not act decisively now we will certainly be facing an even more belligerent and more fearsomely armed Red China in the near future — and on the battlefield of their choosing. — William F. Jasper

WHO Pandemic Treaty: It's Ba-a-ack!

"WHO Member States conclude negotiations and make significant progress on draft pandemic agreement." That's the heading of a press release from the World Health Organization on April 16.

We are told the proposed agreement is "to be submitted to World Health Assembly in May for consideration."

The press release states:

> After more than three years of intensive negotiations, WHO Member States took a major step forward in efforts to make the world safer from pandemics, by forging a draft agreement for consideration at the upcoming World Health Assembly in May. The proposal aims to strengthen global collaboration on prevention, preparedness and response to future pandemic threats.

This is another good reason to "Get US out! of the United Nations." Need a refresher on the tyrannical threat from this WHO monstrosity? See here, here, here, and here. — William F. Jasper

UN Global Shipping Carbon Tax, Not Tariffs, Is the Real Threat

It's really rich! The politicians and commentators who are now whining that the Trump tariffs will make Aunt Suzie's yoga pants more expensive are the same hypocrites who have habitually voted for the multi-trillion-dollar budgets that are causing the inflation they claim to be concerned about.

But the whining and wailing about tariffs is helping conceal an imminent threat of global taxation. We are talking about the UN's new, about-to-be-implemented carbon tax on global shipping. Meeting at the London Headquarters of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), a "specialized agency" of the United Nations, 63 nations voted on April 11 in favor of adopting regulations that will set mandatory marine fuel standard and Green House Gas emissions pricing for shipping to address climate change.

"The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has achieved another important step towards establishing a legally binding framework to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from ships globally, aiming for net-zero emissions by or around, i.e close to 2050," declares the IMO website. "The IMO Net-zero Framework is the first in the world to combine mandatory emissions limits and GHG pricing across an entire industry sector."

It goes on: "These measures, set to be formally adopted in October 2025 before entry into force in 2027, will become mandatory for large ocean-going ships over 5,000 gross tonnage, which emit 85% of the total CO_2 emissions from international shipping."

As we have been reporting at *The New American* for many years, the UN shipping tax has been cited by globalists as the most viable avenue for establishing UN taxing authority. As far back as the 2010 UN Climate Summit in Cancun, Mexico, we warned of the shipping tax scheme, which is the camel's nose inside the taxation

MARK YOUR CALENDARS
APRIL 22
Register Now: Sign up for the LIVE Watch Party beginning at 7PM CT
Watch for Free for 30 days: Starting April 22 at 8 PM CT
STAND YOUR GROUND STUDIOS
U.N. EARTHING
THE CO2 PIPELINE
STREAM ON The John Birch Society JBS
YouTube
The John Birch Society

tent. More recently, we have exposed this plan here, here, and here. This precedent is just that — a precedent. It doesn't stop there. Bad as it is, it will only get worse if we allow it to go into effect. As *TNA* senior editor Alex Newman explained following his attendance at the UN Climate Summit in Baku, Azerbaijan, last year ("UN Demands Tyranny & Trillions From US Middle Class for "Climate"), the UN shakedown artists plan to raise *trillions* of dollars through a plethora of taxes and carbon credit/carbon market schemes with the BlackRock/ Goldman Sachs/WEF-type corporate globalists.

The Trump administration sent a letter to IMO member states urging opposition to the proposed mandates. "Should such a blatantly unfair measure go forward, our government will consider reciprocal measures so as to offset any fees charged to U.S. ships and compensate the American people for any other economic harm from any adopted GHG emissions measures," the letter, which was leaked to Bloomberg and Politico, said. "The Trump administration will protect the American people and their economic interests."

"The U.N. should halt all efforts to proliferate the deeply unfair agenda reflected in the Paris Agreement in other fora," the leaked document said, noting that "[a] plain reading of these measures is that they are foremost an effort to redistribute wealth under the guise of environmental protection."

Yet *another* reason to "*Get US Out!*"
— William F. Jasper

Gold, Silver Make Advances in State Legislation

Utah, Alabama, Idaho, Kentucky: Good things have been happening in all those states on the sound money front. On April 11, Alabama Governor Kay Ivey signed Senate Bill 130 into law, reaffirming gold and silver as legal tender. Weeks earlier, Money Metals reported positive developments in Idaho regarding removal of capital gains taxes on gold and silver:

> House Bill 40, sponsored by House Speaker Mike Moyle and begrudgingly signed by the state's liberal Republican governor Brad Little, provides a sweeping $253 million income tax cut for Idahoan taxpayers by lowering the rate from 5.695% to 5.3% while also adding two specific exemptions.
>
> The new law includes a tax-neutral provision whereby taxpayers back out any "net capital gains or losses that meet the definition of precious metal bullion or monetized bullion …

> included in the taxpayer's federal adjusted gross income."
>
> Idaho already had a long-standing sales tax exemption on purchases of precious metals. By exempting income connected with precious metals sales, it now becomes less difficult for gold and silver to resume their constitutional role as money in Idaho. All tax cuts contained in HB 40 take effect as of January 1, 2025, pursuant to the bill's emergency provisions.

The Idaho legislature followed that up a couple weeks later with a bill that was signed into law making gold and silver legal tender in Idaho. Again, Money Metal reports: "For the second time this month, new sound money legislation has become law in Idaho. Faced with the overwhelming likelihood of a veto override from the legislature, Idaho Governor Brad Little signed the *Idaho Constitutional Money Act of 2025* reaffirming gold and silver as legal tender and making a symbolic statement in favor of sound money principles."

Then we have Utah. "Utah passed a bill, with unanimous support in the House, to make gold a transactional currency," Liberty Sentinel reported. "The move, which makes the Beehive State the first to do so in the nation, was vetoed by Republican governor Spencer Cox. Most likely the legislation will persist with a veto override from the legislature." The bill's sponsor, Representative Ken Ivory (R), joined Alex Newman in a video interview to break down the legislation, pointing out that gold currency is a constitutional mandate created by the Founding Fathers and a hedge against inflation.

Finally, Kentucky. The Sound Money Defense League reported on March 27:

> Three Kentucky taxpayers and one of America's largest precious metals dealers today filed a class-action lawsuit against Governor Andrew Beshear, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and the Kentucky Department of Revenue for their illegal sales tax collections in connection with retail purchases of physical gold and silver.
>
> Money Metals Exchange, Jill Stahl Huston, Stacie Earl, and Karen Strayer filed the state court complaint in the Boone Circuit Court on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated Kentucky taxpayers and precious metals dealers across America.
>
> The class-action suit comes immediately on the heels of overwhelming votes by both the Kentucky House and Senate to override Gov. Beshear's veto this week of House Bill 2, a measure which expanded last year's new sales tax exemption for precious metals purchases.
>
> HB 2, which became law today, provides a right for full recovery of unlawfully collected taxes (plus interest), stiff penalties on state officials (acting in their official capacities and potentially, their personal capacities), and attorney's fees for the Department of Revenue's flagrant violation of a sales tax exemption that had taken effect on August 1, 2024.

"In 2024, the Kentucky legislature passed House Bill 8 to remove the state's 6% sales tax on purchases of gold and silver coins, bars, and rounds," the Sound Money Legal Defense League noted. "Gov. Beshear had attempted to exercise a line-item veto that the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Kentucky had only created for appropriations bills."

Rather than override the veto of HB 8 last year, however, the legislature deemed the veto invalid and the Revisor of Statutes codified the sales tax exemption in accordance with the state Attorney General Russell Coleman's legal opinion.

Nevertheless, Governor Beshear, a pro-abortion, pro-LGBTQ, pro-gun control Democrat, insisted that all Kentucky citizens must pay, and all businesses that sell gold and silver must continue to collect and remit, such taxes or face prosecution. — William F. Jasper

Health Freedom: Ivermectin OTC Wins in Arkansas, Idaho

Arkansas Governor Sarah Huckabee signed Senate Bill 189 into law, making ivermectin available as an over-the-counter medication, as well as making Arkansas the second state, after Tennessee, to approve OTC ivermectin. This was followed up on April 11 with Idaho

Cosamin®
for JOINT HEALTH
nutramax LABORATORIES CONSUMER CARE, INC.
helps promote joint comfort so you can enjoy life's special moments*
#1 RESEARCHED GLUCOSAMINE/ CHONDROITIN BRAND
SAVE 20%
Enter Code LIBERTY20 for discount.
Visit nutramaxstore.com
Cosamin DS JOINT HEALTH
Cosamin ASU JOINT HEALTH
THESE STATEMENTS HAVE NOT BEEN EVALUATED BY THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION. THIS PRODUCT IS NOT INTENDED TO DIAGNOSE, TREAT, CURE, OR PREVENT ANY DISEASE.
Based on U.S. studies published in peer-reviewed journals. The Cosamin® Brand is the most researched glucosamine/chondroitin sulfate brand.

Governor Brad Little signing Senate Bill 1211, allowing ivermectin to be sold over-the-counter without a prescription or consultation with a healthcare professional. — William F. Jasper

Second Announcement for Our Premier Showing of Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline

Big News! Premier Showing! Sign up now for the free, online live viewing of our powerful new documentary, *UNearthing the CO_2 Pipeline*. This viewing will also include the bonus of a live webinar featuring commentary by, and a Q&A with, Mike Boyle and *TNA* Senior Editor Rebecca Terrell. You do not want to miss this. Mark the date: April 22, Earth Day. It's just a coincidence, *of course*, that April 22 is also the birthday of Vladimir Lenin, the mass-murdering Bolshevik founder of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, carbon-capture pipelines are but the latest of the Enviro-Leninists' weapons of mass destruction aimed at complete obliteration of our economy and our freedoms.

It is a huge mistake to assume that the CO_2 pipeline threat is an issue that only affects the Midwest corn belt. Carbon-capture pipeline projects are in various stages of planning and/or construction in states from coast to coast. This is a major part of Agenda 2030, the Green New Deal, and the Great Reset. *The New American* and The John Birch Society have been in the forefront of this battle. Rebecca Terrell has been reporting on this issue for years and has been on the ground meeting with and interviewing key players (farmers, ranchers, state legislators, county commissioners, congressmen, and coalition leaders) in the pipeline fight. She has become the leading expert on this vital topic and the driving force behind this blockbuster documentary.

Please view the video trailers below and share them on social media:

Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline: Harassment

Unearthing the CO_2 Pipeline: The Time Bomb in Your Backyard

Also, register for the April 22 Live Viewing: UNearthing the CO_2 Pipeline Documentary with Rebecca Terrell and Michael Boyle.

Then, go to Stand Your Ground Studios where we have many CO_2 pipeline videos posted, including the extended interviews with people whose testimony is central to the documentary. Stand Your Ground Studios, an affiliate of the John Birch Society and *The New American*, has done a stupendous job with this video documentary, and the film deserves the widest possible viewing. Please use this as an outreach tool with all of those in your area who are involved in or concerned about farming, ranching, property rights, energy, taxes, and government waste and corruption.

For more information on the CO_2 pipeline scam, these are some of the many articles/videos we have posted on the subject:

Twelve Steps to Preparing Your County for Dangerous Carbon-capture Pipelines

CO2 Pipelines: Trampling on Property Rights & Local Control

Why Should You Care About Carbon Capture?

Standing Firm for Property Rights

Illinois Deals Blow to CO2 Storage; Carbon Capture Heads to ND Supreme Court

Iowa Farmer Warns Carbon Capture Pipeline Could Be Life Threatening

Read them, view them, share them. — William F. Jasper

[END]